

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 11, 12, 18, and 19 are currently pending in the application. New Claims 18 and 19 have been added, Claims 1, 2, and 4-7 have been amended, and Claims 8-10 and 13-17 have been cancelled.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-5, 8 and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Long 4,609,577, and rejected Claims 6-7 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Long 4,609,577.

Independent Claims 1 and 4 have been amended to recite in part a bath of molten coating alloy containing aluminum. Claims 8-10 and 13-17 have been cancelled.

Long 4,609,577 does not disclose, show or suggest a bath of molten coating alloy containing aluminum as now recited in Independent Claim 1 and 4. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the above referenced rejections.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ookouchi et al 5,571,327 in view of Long 4,609,577.

Claims 9, 10 and 13 have been cancelled and Claims 11 and 12 ultimately depend from amended Independent Claims 1 and 4 respectively.

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Long fails to teach his roller or component is used in a hot dip coating apparatus. The Examiner also states that Ookouchi et al teaches a method of manufacturing a sink roller for a hot dip coating process wherein the sink roller is

constructed by casting using an austenitic stainless steel material. The Examiner then concludes that it would have therefore been obvious to modify the Ookouchi et al process for manufacturing a sink roller by casting using another known austenitic stainless steel material such as taught by Long for the taught advantage of his austenitic stainless steel material - increased service life in high temperature environments and especially in view of Ookouchi et al teaching at column 16 lines 48-52 that its material for use in a molten metal environment may be used in other high temperature environments.

However, performance in one environment is not necessarily indicative of performance in another. The subject matter of the present application is concerned with stainless steel containing nitrogen having improved performance life in the very particular high temperature environment of molten 55% Al-Zn alloy at around 600°C. Metal that is corrosion resistant in one environment is not necessarily corrosion resistant in another environment.

Long discloses improved machinability, metal-to-metal wear resistance and corrosion resistance (referring to aqueous corrosion resistance or to resistance to high temperature oxidation only) for a metal roll used in a continuous casting environment and hot-strip mill run-out tables, i.e. the rolls are exposed to high temperatures and contact with hot metal surfaces and water cooling sprays.

Paragraphs [0040] to [0044] of the present application disclose the benefits obtained by having nitrogen present in stainless steel when it is used in contact with molten 55% Al-Zn alloy. These benefits would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art from the teachings of Long or Ookouchi et al, alone or in combination.

For at least the reasons stated above, it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art that the improved performance in the environment described in Long would provide improved performance in all high temperature environments, and especially not in contact with

molten 55% Al-Zn alloy. Thus, for at least this reason, it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the material of Long with the coating apparatus of Ookouchi.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite. Applicant believes that the present amendments to the claims address this rejection and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-7, 11, 12, 18, and 19 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a notice thereof. Applicant encourages the Examiner to call its counsel, Arland T. Stein, at 614-233-5104 to resolve any additional questions that the Examiner may have to place the claims in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 1, 2008

/James D. Schweikert/
James D. Schweikert
Reg. No. 58,057

Hahn Loeser + Parks LLP
One GOJO Plaza
Suite 300
Akron, Ohio 44311-1076
(330) 864-5550